

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of May 23, 2008, claims 1-5 were rejected. Claim 2 was cancelled in a previous amendment and remains cancelled.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026) (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of *Ono et al.* (JP 2000-289320) (“*Ono*”) and *George et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,487,122) (“*George*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 now recites:

“the length of the gravure roll is substantially the same as the length of the silicon blanket, and the tapered portion of the gravure roll is located over a non-pixel forming area.”

This is clearly unlike, *Ishikawa*, which fails to disclose the tapered portion of a gravure roll being located over a non-pixel forming area and the length of the gravure roll being substantially equal to the length of the silicon blanket. Instead, *Ishikawa* discloses a blanket cylinder on a silicone blanket without tapered ends or the length defined relative to the silicon blanket length. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026, Para [0037].

As the Examiner states in the May 23, 2008 Office Action, *Ono* fails to disclose a gravure roll with tapered edges.

George, similarly, fails to disclose the tapered portion of a gravure roll being located over a non-pixel forming area and the length of the gravure roll being substantially equal to the length

of the silicon blanket. Instead, *George* discloses a gravure roll with rounded edges which is longer than the impression roll on which it sits. See, U.S. Patent No. 4,487,122, Fig. 1.

As the applicant's specification discloses, by providing the tapered portion of a gravure roll located over a non-pixel forming area and the length of the gravure roll being substantially equal to the length of a silicon blanket, the non uniformity of the layer width of the contacted liquid portion is absorbed by the non-pixel forming area resulting in a small and uniform coating film on the silicone blanket. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para [0051].

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono*, *George* and any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Ono*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 3 recites forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket.

As the Examiner states in the May 23, 2008 Office Action, *Ishakawa* does not disclose that ink is supplied on to a silicon blanket via a slit made of two flat plates.

Ono, similarly, fails to disclose forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the

rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket. Instead, *Ono* discloses a die coater without slanting ends located over a non-pixel forming area. See, JP 2000-289320, Para. [0013].

As the applicant's specification discloses, by forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket, the non uniformity of the layer width of the contacted liquid portion is absorbed by the non-pixel forming area resulting in a small and uniform coating film on the silicone blanket. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para [0075].

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono* and any combination of the them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 3, the rejection cannot stand. Because claim 4 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3, it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Ono* and in further view of *Suga* (U.S. Patent No. 5,853,801) ("*Suga*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, claim 3 is patentable over *Ishikawa* and *Ono*.

Suga, similarly, fails to disclose forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the

rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket. Instead, *Suga* discloses a wire bar supported at both ends by bearings and coating of the wire bar using coating wells. See, U.S. Patent No. 5,853,801, Col. 12, l. 63-Col. 13, l. 1-20.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono*, *Suga* and any combination of the them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 3, the rejection cannot stand. Because claim 5 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3, it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 17, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000